



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPORTS.

### ENGLISCHE STUDIEN.<sup>1</sup> Volume XXIX.

1. Kempe. A Middle English Tale of Troy. This is the version of the Troy legend preserved in 283 leaves of Laud Misc. MS. 595 in the Bodleian. Miss Kempe discusses the following topics: Manuscript and Authorship; Date; Relation of the Poem to the accounts by Guido and Benoit; The Poem as Illustrative of English Contemporary Life; Style. With this article may be summarized one on the same subject by Wülfling, on pp. 374 ff. of this volume. Besides correcting a considerable number of minor errors in Miss Kempe's article, Wülfling takes issue with her upon certain points, apparently with good reason. This text, known as the Laud Troy Book, was considered by Joly in his study of the relations between Benoit and Guido: his conclusions are unsupported by Miss Kempe, who thinks the poem is derived immediately from Guido, without use of Benoit; but Wülfling discovers some indications in it of acquaintance with the latter. He finds a strong resemblance between the Laud version and the alliterative Troy Book, and important evidence that these two and Barbour's version were related to an unknown predecessor, perhaps in French. Wülfling gives 1400 as an approximate date of the poem, and is inclined to regard it as contemporary in origin with Lydgate's Troy Book (1414-1420). Incidentally he corrects a displacement of lines in the manuscript. He has since completed the *editio princeps* of the text, published by the Early English Text Society.

Bobertag. Pope's Relation to the Aufklärung of the Eighteenth Century. A somewhat prolix analysis of Pope's unsystematic and contradictory ideas upon religion and ethics, based chiefly upon the Essay on Man. Though one of the important men of the movement he appears hardly to be identified with any single phase of it. He seems not to have accepted Christianity as a historical fact, yet he was neither pantheist nor deist, but believed in a personal God.

Among the reviews is a long and excellent discussion, by Logeman, of Jespersen's Fonetik.—Stoffels says of Franz' Shakespeare Grammatik, that it must supersede Abbott's Grammar, notwithstanding its failure to discuss Elizabethan pronunciation and Shakespeare's metre. The review includes some twenty-four pages of corrections and additional illustrations.—Streitberg reviews Osthoff's Vom Suppletivwesen der Indogermanischen

<sup>1</sup> By some oversight the Report of Volumes XXXI and XXXII (A. J. P. XXV 272) preceded instead of following XXIX and XXX.—B. L. G.

Sprachen. 'Suppletivwesen' is a term substituted by Osthoff for 'Defectivsystem', as applied to verbs such as ὀράω, εἶδον, etc.; to feminines formed from stems differing from those of the corresponding masculines, such as *Mutter* corresponding to *Vater*; to comparison of adjectives by different stems (*bonus, melior, optimus*); to the difference of stem between the ordinal and the cardinal of certain numerals (*unus, primus*); finally to pronouns declined on different stems (*ich, mir, sie, er*). Osthoff maintains that these are not defective remnants of originally complete systems or paradigms, but that they have always been defective, and have come by a sort of levelling or organizing process—really a kind of analogy—to supply each other's defects. Streitberg says that Osthoff neglects the earlier and most important stage of the development. A primitive people may have several words each designating a particular phase or method of a certain action, before they are able to invent a general word designating the common action. Thus the Cherokees had as yet no word for 'wash,' though they had words meaning respectively 'to wash one's own head', 'to wash another's head,' 'to wash hands and feet', 'to wash clothes' etc. It will be remembered that 'Suppletivwesen' is usually found among words most frequently used, and those which were most likely to be the ones earliest required. Thus perhaps ἔσθιεν and φάγεῖν, or *bonus, melior, optimus*, may have existed as synonyms, but representing slightly different phases of their common ideas. These differences were such as assisted them in the course of time, by the levelling process, to assume their present grammatical relations to each other, losing meanwhile, in part, or altogether, their earlier distinctions of meaning. In such systems as *sum, fui; am, was*, these distinctions are lost, but in such a case as ὀπᾶν, ἰδεῖν, the difference of meaning is still perceptible.

2. Sarrazin. The Origin of the Diphthongs *ai* and *au* in Modern English. The author attempts to reply to Luick's damaging criticism of his article on this subject, both in Volume XXVII. On pp. 405 ff. of the present volume Luick replies in turn, briefly, but decisively, without adding new material to the discussion.

Richter. An Old Portuguese Version of the Lear Saga. A reprint and translation into German of the story of Lear contained in an extract from a Breton chronicle found in the Livro do Conde de Barcelho, being the fourth of the Livros de Linhagens, and closely related to the Munich Brut. It has no importance with respect to Shakespeare's play.

Kraeger. The German Spy (1738). This is the title of a collection of letters purporting to come from an Englishman in his travels on the Continent, to a friend at home. It contains some account of Bremen and Hamburg, together with divers

allegories and tales. The latter are drawn from a periodical of 1725-1727 modelled upon the *Spectator*, and using much of its material. Kraeger points out some curious examples of this successive appropriation, in one case the matter borrowed returned eventually to England and appeared in the *Connoisseur*.

Michelsonn. *Brain and Speech*. The author traces the evolution of the human nervous system, and discusses the localization of various functions of language and speech in the brain, and the modifications of the surface and structure of the brain which accompany the various degrees of linguistic attainment. The author claims great importance for this kind of physiological study in the science of language—a claim not supported by his article.

3. Blöte. *The Origin of the Tradition of the Knight of the Swan* among certain English Noble Families. Any claims to descent from the knight of the swan must derive either from one of the three brothers, Eustace of Boulogne, Godfrey, and Balduin, or from Roger of Spain. Such claims in England do not appear before 1300, and consist chiefly in a heraldic use of the swan. The principal claimants were Robert of Tony (d. 1310); Guy of Beauchamp (d. 1316), Edward of Stafford, third Duke of Buckingham; and Thomas of Woodstock (d. 1397), sixth son of Edward III., who alleged his right to the claim through his wife's family, the Bohuns. In each case the claim is late, and, so far as the author can discover, quite unfounded.

Morsbach. *Notes on the Havelok*. Upwards of a dozen notes in textual criticism.

Lange. *Lydgate and Fragment B of the Romaunt of the Rose*. An unconvincing attempt to prove, by evidence of style and rhyme, that Lydgate was the translator.

Hempl. English *beach*, *beck* (n.), *pebble*. The author first attempts to show that *beach*, *beck* and Germ. *Bach* are the same word. An examination of O. E. *bæc* and *bēc* shows that these two forms are really one word wavering between the *a*- and the *i*-declension. It passed into the *i*-declension perhaps through the early and frequently used locative *\*bæci* of the *a*-declension. From either form the normal modern English development is *beach* (M. E. *bēche*). North English *beck* is from the O. N. cognate *bekkr*. The development of the word proves that neither Sweet's and Kluge's *baki*-, nor Kluge's variant stem *\*bakki*-, nor *\*bakja*-, is the stem of the word. As to signification, from the first meaning—'place where water babbles over pebbles'—the development has been twofold: (1) 'pebbly spot in a stream', then, 'pebbles with or without water', then, 'pebbly seashore', 'beach'; (2) 'brook', then, 'stream-course', then, 'ravine'. O. E. *bæc*, *bēc*, the author thinks, mean not 'brook', but 'ravine', and

'pebbly spot in a stream.' *Bak* is a syllable in its origin imitative of the sound of running water, as is the syllable *peb* in *pebble* and its antecedents.

Wülfing, in a review of Keller's *Die Litterarischen Bestrebungen von Worcester in Angelsächsischer Zeit*, speaks of it as a clear and remarkably suggestive account.—Logeman says that Cushman, in his study *The Devil and the Vice in the English Drama before Shakespeare*, has not succeeded in defining the character of the Vice, nor in identifying it in specific cases, though his theory that the characters of Devil, Vice, Fool, Clown, and Villain, 'are parallel and of independent origin and function', is probably right. The whole subject needs further study.

A note in the *Miscellanea* by Hoffmann, on Byron's *Giaour*, discusses points which were raised by Kölbing in a review of the author's book in Volume XXVI.

Volume XXX. I. Smith, *The Chief Differences between the First and the Second Folio of Shakespeare*. Such differences are greater than critics have believed. They are rather syntactical than exegetical, and arose from the publishers' desire to render more 'correct' and bookish the unfettered syntax of the First Folio; in other words, to make a more readable edition. Most of the changes aim to restore concord of subject and predicate, especially by changing a singular predicate into a plural. The author fills ten pages with examples.

Boyle. *Troilus and Cressida*. An endeavor to show that the love story of the play was written by Shakespeare probably earlier than *Romeo and Juliet*; that he added the Ulysses story about 1606, when he recast the first three acts of the play; but that he abandoned the play to take up *Timon*; and that Marston added later the Hector story.

Meissner. *Lieutenant Cassio and Ancient Iago*. A study of the comparative rank implied by these titles in the time of Shakespeare. It is well-known that the poet for dramatic reasons, reversed the relative rank of these characters as represented in *Cinthio*, and made Cassio the higher of the two. Meissner finds that the lieutenant stood second to the commander-in-chief, with occasional command of all the troops, and that the ancient, though of lower rank, probably stood high in the important order of standard-bearers, enjoying personal relations of great intimacy with the officer first in command.

Fernow. On *Tempest* I. 2. 387–394. In his review of Franz' *Shakespeare Grammatik* in Volume XXIX Stoffel proposed to restore the punctuation of the First Folio in ll. 389, 390. Fernow defends the modern reading, which dates from Pope.

Luckwaldt. On the Origin of the Boer War.

2. Koeppel. Byron's *Astarte*. The principal source of *Manfred* is not Shelley's early novel, *St. Irvyne*, but a story of incestuous love which appeared in 1802 in Chateaubriand's *Le Génie du Christianisme*, and in 1805 was inserted in his *Atala*. Its influence appears chiefly in the character of *Astarte*, but also in that of *Manfred*, though the latter is considerably changed and heightened by Byron as compared with its original. The character of the abbot and certain details of the story seem also to have been suggested by the French narrative.

Kölbing. On the History of the Composition of *Childe Harold* I, II. From Kölbing's literary remains, being the beginning of the introduction to his proposed edition of *Childe Harold*. The article consists chiefly of contemporary letters and notes bearing upon Byron's revision of the first draft, from which he removed certain blemishes and expressions of extreme opinion. Byron's autograph of the first draft was, in 1832, in possession of Henry Drury of Harrow, but has since disappeared.

Bernthsen. The Influence of Pliny in Shelley's Earlier Works. Shelley read Pliny before he read Spinoza, and certain strongly pantheistic utterances, especially in the *Necessity of Atheism*, and the *Refutation of Deism*, are traceable to Pliny's *Natural History*. Pliny's influence upon Shelley's idea of God is, however, quite superseded by that of Spinoza's profounder and nobler teaching.

Richter. On Shelley's Philosophy (concluded in Number 3). The author first corrects certain errors of method and result in Bernthsen's *Der Spinozismus in Shelley's Weltanschauung*. She discusses the following topics: Shelley's *Necessity of Atheism*, *Queen Mab*, *Pantheism*, *Amor Intellectualis*, *Intellectual Beauty*, *Necessity and Free Will*, *Good and Evil*, *The State and Society*, *The Millennium*, *Immortality*. The conclusion is, in effect, that in any case Shelley must, to the end of his life, be regarded as only 'ein Werdender'; 'das natürliche ausreifen und ausklingen ist ihm versagt'. At first he was influenced by English empiricists, especially Locke, and by French materialists, especially Volney and Holbach; later by Plato, Spinoza, and Christianity. The influence of Godwin as an eclectic is at all times perceptible. Shelley so assimilated the ideas which he gathered from others, that each appears in a peculiar form in his works. His pantheism is characterized by his identifying nature, beauty, and love, in one supreme power; his conception of freedom by his insistence upon absolute control over oneself as the true independence, and upon reform of oneself as the necessary means thereto; and his conception of immortality is marked by belief in absorption in nature after death. The article is important for all students of Shelley.

Reviews. Henderson discusses Brown's *The Wallace* and the Bruce restudied, an attempt to prove these poems mere forgeries. He regrets that so much labor and ingenuity should be rendered futile by the domination of 'a wildly improbable hypothesis'.

In the Miscellanea are the following notes: on Beowulf 1363, from E. M. Wright; on Havelok, from Holthausen; on a XIV. Century Version of the Ancren Riwe, from Paues; on the Authorship of Advice, from Lange; on Mandeville's Fable of the Bees, from Krueger. Wülfing is the author of lexical notes on the following O. E. words: *bewitan*, *circ-hata*, *ealdgefā*, *eodorcan*, *forslæwan*, *gewerian*, *græs*, *onrreran* and *unhlidian*, *togeanan*.

3. Holthausen. Contributions to the History of the Phonological Development of Modern English. Four hitherto unnoticed Dutch-English Grammars of the dates 1646, 1664, 1705, and 1758 respectively, and a Portuguese-English grammar of 1762, are described by the author, and the phonological equivalents which they record are given.

Horn. On Modern English Phonology. Notes on the pronunciation in modern dialects, of *tl-*, *dl-*, for *cl-*, *gl-*; *-in*, *-ingg-*, *ink*, for *-ing*.

Koeppel. Omission of *rather* before *than*. A brief note.

Björkmann. Etymological Notes. On Modern English *elk*, *fry* (small fish), *groom*, *hug*, *nasty*, and Middle English *likpot*. *Elk* is probably Scandinavian; *fry* may be connected with O. F. *froie* (cf. O. F. *frier*, Godefroy); *nasty* may be from Dan. *nasket* + Eng. *y*.

Wyld. In Explanation of Modern English *kex* (hemlock). The author derives it from W. S. *\*cȳsc*, *\*cȳx* (O. Kent. *\*cēsc*, *\*cēx*) < Germ. *\*kunski-z* < Idg. *\*ǵnt-kī*, and adds the forms of the word in the various dialects.

In this number seven recent publications on Chaucer are reviewed by Koch, and one by Koeppel. They include Kirk's Enrolments and Documents from the Public Record Office, etc., comprising all known Records relating to Chaucer; Spielmann's The Portraits of Geoffrey Chaucer, Skeat's The Chaucer Canon, Maynadier's Sources and Analogues of the Wife of Bath's Tale, and Petersen's Sources of the Parson's Tale.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES G. OSGOOD, JR.

## REVUE DE PHILOGIE, VOL. XXVII.

### No. I.

1. Pp. 5-12. The buildings of the Acropolis, after the Anonymus Argentinensis, by P. Foucart. The document examined is a Greek papyrus, found in Egypt, and published by Bruno Keil in 1902. The author of this article discusses the papyrus critically and draws much interesting information from it in regard to

the dates of events connected with the building of the Parthenon and the Propylaea and the dedication of the Athena Parthenos of Phidias.

2. Pp. 13-20. Georges Romain critically discusses ten passages of Plaut. Epidicus.

3. Pp. 21-25. Ciceronian Studies. II. Use of the Demonstrative Pronoun coordinated with a Relative. By Jules Lebreton.

The investigation leads to the conclusion that the demonstrative is employed only in cases where the relative would be inconvenient or impossible. These cases are enumerated and illustrated.

4. Pp. 26-36. The Parisian MSS of Gregory Nazianzen. (Continuation). By A. Misier.

5. Pp. 37-48. Notes on some Palimpsests of Turin, by Emile Chatelain. These contain fragments of Livy, Cassianus, Eusebius translated by Rufinus, and Cassiodorus.

6. Pp. 49-51. Note on an Inscription of Ephesus, by B. Haussoullier. The author announces a study of the papers of Huyot, which he declares to be of great value.

7. P. 51. In Plaut. Persa 159 Louis Havet proposes *Πόθεν τ'* ornamenta (crasis, presumably, not elision).

8. P. 52. Dr. M. L. Earle proposes an ingenious rearrangement of Caes. B. G. I, 1.

9. Pp. 53-63. The Text of Seneca the Elder. (Conclusion). By Henri Bornecque.

10. P. 64. Critical note on Plaut. Men. 98 (read *it* after *illic*), by Louis Havet.

11. Pp. 65-78. Notes on the Text of the Institutiones of Cassiodorus, by Victor Mortet.

12. Pp. 79-81. A false god of the Chaldaean Oracles, by J. Bidez. It is a question of one *Ὑπεζωκός* who owes his existence to a misconception.

13. Pp. 81-85. New fragments of Soterichus? By J. Bidez. The doubtful fragments are found on two leaves of papyrus from Gizeh published by Reitzenstein in 1901.

14. Pp. 86-88. Latin Studies (Continuation). Supplementary note on 'quid est quod'. By F. Gaffiot. Additional examples explained according to the principle enunciated in the former article.

15. Pp. 89-110. Book Notices. 1) Homer's *Odyssee* erklärt von J. U. Faesi. Erster Band. Neunte Auflage bearbeitet von Adolf Kaegi. Berlin, 1901. Reviewed by E. Chambry, who describes the work, points out its merits which are great, makes



some adverse comments on certain details, and declares that it marks progress not only over the edition of Faesi, but also that of Ameis-Hentze, though it cannot replace the latter, which remains indispensable for philologists. 2) *Herakleitos von Ephesos*. Griechisch und deutsch von Hermann Diels. Berlin, 1901. Albert Martin gives a brief analysis with favorable comment. 3) *Eschyle. L'Orestie*. Traduction nouvelle publiée avec une Introduction sur la légende, un Commentaire rythmique et des Notes, par Paul Mazon. Paris, 1903. L. Bodin reviews this work very favorably, but takes exception to a good many details. He says: M. Mazon n'a pas cru qu'il fût nécessaire, pour traduire Eschyle, de ne pas écrire en français et sa traduction de l'Orestie est à la fois brillante et remarquablement fidèle. 4) L. Bodin et P. Mazon, *Extraits d'Aristophane*. Paris, 1902. O. Navarre finds this work very learned,—almost too learned for the use of classes. He analyzes the work, calling attention to some slight faults, and highly praises it as a whole, and especially the part devoted to the particles. 5) *Thucydidis Historiae ad optimos codices denuo ab ipso collatos*. Recensuit Dr. Carolus Hude. Tomus alter. Libri V–VIII. Leipzig, 1901. Briefly and in some respects rather unfavorably mentioned by Albert Martin, who concedes, however, that the work marks considerable progress. 6) *Hermiae Alexandrini in Platonis Phaedrum Scholia . . .* ed. et app. crit. ornavit P. Couvreur. Paris, 1901. Favorably reviewed by G. Rodier, who gives a considerable list of passages in which the critical procedure of the author seems at least doubtful to him. 7) *Quaestiones Platonicae*, scripsit Gualtherus Janell. Leipzig, 1901. G. Rodier, after discussing briefly the nature of the chronology problem, expresses the opinion that this work brings a useful contribution,—seemingly to the evidence that certain lines of investigation should be abandoned. The statistics of hiatus lead Janell to this order: Lysis, Euthydemus, Parmenides, Charmides, Republic I, Phaedo, Protagoras, Republic IX and IV, Apology, Meno, Hippias Minor, Crito, Banquet, Gorgias, Euthyphro, Republic VII, X, Laches, Republic VIII, Theaetetus, Republic VI, II, III, V, Cratylus, Menexenus, Phaedrus, Laws V, III, XII, X, II, XI, I, IX, IV, Philebus, Timaeus, Critias, Sophista, Politicus. Whether the author really believes in this, the reviewer leaves unclear. 8) *Schüler-Kommentar zu Platons Euthyphron*, von Dr. G. Schneider. Leipzig, 1902. G. Rodier commends the brevity and cheapness of this school-edition. 9) Three works mentioned together: a) *The Iliad of Homer*. Books IX and X. Edited with introduction and notes by J. C. Lawson. Cambridge, 1902. b) *Omero, L'Iliade, commentata da C. O. Zuretti*. Vol. IV, ch. XIII–XVI. Turin, 1902. c) *Lisia. Orazioni scelte commentate da Eug. Ferrai*. Vol. I. Seconda edizione rifatta da Giuseppe Fraccaroli. Turin, 1902. Albert Martin mentions briefly these works, commending, with some reserve, the edition of Lawson, and pro-

nouncing the Italian edition not without value. The edition of select orations of Lysias he finds on the whole satisfactory, but not without fault. 10) Cassii Dionis Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt edidit U. Philippus Boissevain. Vol. III. Berlin, 1901. Analyzed and favorably criticised by A. M. 11) T. Macci Plauti Epidicus iterum recensuit G. Goetz. Leipzig, 1902. Georges Romain, recognizing the merits of this edition, finds it entirely too conservative. 12) F. Pradei. De praepositione in prisca Latinitate ui atque usu. Leipzig, 1901. G. R. makes brief and rather unfavorable mention of this work. 13) G. Lodge. Lexicon Plautinum (A—ALIVS). Leipzig, 1901. Favorably mentioned by G. R. 14) Four works mentioned together: a) M. Tullii Ciceronis in M. Antonium oratio Philippica prima . . . par H. de la Ville de Mirmont. Paris, 1902. b) Schülerkommentar zu Ciceros Philippischen Reden I, II, III, VII, von Hermann Nohl. Leipzig, 1903. c) M. Tulli Ciceronis orationes in L. Catilinam quattuor. Edited by J. C. Nicol. Cambridge, 1902. d) M. Tullio Cicerone, il primo libro de officiis commentato dal dott. prof. G. Segre. Torino, 1902. J. L. finds the first named work suitable for advanced students, but weak in its critical apparatus. The second work he merely describes as being intended for gymnasium students. The third he considers useful for pupils. The last, which gives only a "historical and philosophical" commentary, he finds prepared carefully and laboriously, but without sufficient method. 15) Carlo Pascal. Di una fonte greca del Somnium Scipionis di Cicerone. Nota letta alla R. Academia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti. Napoli, 1902. J. L. briefly mentions this paper with approval as showing that "the cosmographic theories so complacently developed in the Dream of Scipio are taken in great part from the 'Hermes', a poem of Eratosthenes." 16) Prolegomena in Pseudocelli de universi natura libellum scripsit Joannes de Heyden-Zielewicz. (Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen, VIII, 3). Breslau, 1901. Briefly analyzed and commended by J. L. 17) Der dem Boethius zugeschriebene Traktat de Fide Catholica, untersucht von E. K. Rand. Leipzig, 1901. Jules Lebreton does not agree with the author that the internal evidence is conclusive against the authorship of Boethius. 18) Der echte Hiob, von Eugen Müller. Hannover, 1902. J. L. gives the substance of this work,—that Job was an atheist, and that the book of Job consists of four parts composed at different times, and adds, "Attendons, pour discuter la thèse de M. M., qu'il ait bien voulu en donner les preuves." 19) P. Huvelin, Les tablettes magiques et le droit romain. Fasc. I. Mâcon, 1901. Norbert Hachez summarizes this work with high appreciation. 20) Dom Fernand Cabrol, Dictionnaire d'archéologie et de liturgie. Paris, 1903. Fr. Cremont, criticising this work in the main favorably, finds that it promises to be too voluminous because of the introduction of unessential matter.

## No. 2.

16. Pp. 111-121. Epigraphic Notes, by J. Delamarre. Discussion of inscriptions from Aegiale, Arcesine, and Minoa, relating to incursions of pirates and services rendered by certain citizens in repelling such incursions or redeeming captives.

17. P. 122. Louis Havet considers "quibus fructibus me decollauit" (cited from Lucilius, Diomedes, p. 365, 4 Keil) an anapaestic dimeter.

18. Pp. 123-4. Louis Havet discusses the rhythm of the prose of Martial's prefaces.

19. Pp. 125-138. Origin of the Bâle edition of Gregory Nazianzen. By A. Misier. This elaborate article shows that the edition in question was derived from the Aldine of 1536 and the Codex Palatinus 402.

20. Pp. 139-150. Notes on the text of the Institutiones of Cassiodorus, by Victor Mortet (fourth article). This article treats; a) the definition of Geometry by Boethius and Cassiodorus compared with that given by Quintilian and Martianus Capella; b) Cassiodorus and the Principia geometricae disciplinae.

21. Pp. 151-3. M. L. Earle criticises Parmentier's treatment of Soph. O. R. 10 f.

22. P. 153. Louis Havet reads angulos usu omnis in Plaut. Aul. 437, and changes id to tu in ibid. 439.

23. Pp. 154-7. The text of the Orator, by Henri Bornecque. Discussion of the question which MS most accurately represents the ancient text. Conclusion in favor of A, though L (that is F O P) is not to be entirely discarded.

24. Pp. 158-163. The seventh paragraph of the papyrus of Strassburg (published by Bruno Keil, 1902), discussed by E. Cavaignac with a view to settling the question of the discontinuation of the *κωλακρέται*.

25. Pp. 164-208. Latin Studies. II. The Subjunctive of Repetition. By F. Gaffiot. It will be remembered that in the *Revue de Philologie* (1884), VIII, pp. 75 ff., M. Bonnet denied that the subjunctive in Latin is ever due to the fact that repetition is expressed. He arrived at the conclusion that the indicative was always the mood of repetition pure and simple, and when the subjunctive was employed, it was "despite the idea of repetition". Gaffiot goes still further and maintains that there is neither subjunctive of repetition nor subjunctive despite repetition: that in none of the passages concerned had the author in his mind the idea of repetition. The authors examined are Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, Cornelius Nepos, Livy, Tacitus.

26. Pp. 209-214. Paul Mazon publishes a translation in French of the Persians of Timotheus of Miletus, with notes.

No. 3.

27. Pp. 215-222. Athens and Thasos at the end of the fifth century, by P. Foucart. An acute discussion of the relations of Thasos to the Athenians, based on an inscription, now much mutilated, but copied with several errors centuries ago, and referred to in Dem. XX. 63 (Tauchnitz).

28. P. 223. *Πρωτόχορος*. P. F. successfully defends this word in the fragments of Alexis and Antidotus quoted by Athenaeus. It is sustained by inscriptions, and probably means *κορυφαῖος*.

29. Pp. 224-232. A dozen passages of Cic. Imp. Pomp. critically discussed by Louis Havet.

30. Pp. 233-5. M. L. Earle makes some acute observations on the interpretation of Hor. Sat. I, 1.

31. Pp. 236-244. Notes on the end and consequences of the Aetolian war, by Wilhelm Vollgraff. The discrepancy between Livy (XXXVII, 9 and 11) and Polybius (XXI, 30 and 32) is ascribed to a deliberate perversion of facts by Livy with a view to placing the Romans in a more favorable light.

32. Pp. 245-7. Paul Tannery defends "auctor gromaticus" in Cassiodor. Variarum III, 52.

33. Pp. 248-261. Book Notices. 1) V. Gardthausen, *Sammungen und Cataloge griechischer Handschriften*. Byzantinisches Archiv, fasc. 3. Leipzig, 1903. D. Serruys finds many serious omissions, but pronounces the work nevertheless a valuable aid to laborers in this field. 2) *Die Temporalsätze mit den Konjunktionen "bis" und "so lange als."* Von Albert Fuchs. Würzburg, 1902. Analyzed by E. Chambry. An interesting treatment of the origin and development of these constructions, but without any results modifying the rules of the present grammars. 3) *Eschilo. I Sette a Tebe con note di Vigilio Inama*. Turin, 1902. P. Mazon, disapproving a few details, highly commends this work. 4) Gevaert und Vollgraff. *Les Problèmes musicaux d'Aristote*. Gand, 1903. L. Laloy commends this work as a whole, but rejects a few details. The genuineness of the book is supported by a new argument of great weight: the vocabulary is not contaminated by the doctrine of Aristoxenus. 5) Dr. Hugo Bretzl. *Botanische Forschungen des Alexanderzuges*. Leipzig, 1903. Paul Tannery reviews at some length. The author shows that Theophrast. *Hist. Plant.* records the botanical discoveries made during the campaigns of Alexander. The reviewer, though not sure that Alexander organized any scientific corps, accepts and highly praises the essentials of the work, but is quite severe on its useless expansion. He commends some of the emendations. 6) Two works of Prof. R.

Methner mentioned together. a) Die Darstellung der lateinischen Temporalsätze in der Obertertia, Bromberg, 1902; b) Über die Begriffe "Situation" und "näherer oder begleitender Umstand" in der lateinischen Syntax, Berlin, 1902. These works are briefly analyzed by F. Gaffiot, and favorably criticised. 7) Inscriptiones Latinae selectae, edidit Hermannus Dessau. Vol. II. Pars. 1. Berolini, 1902-4. Victor Chapot, after finding a number of faults, expresses high appreciation of the work as a whole. 8) Lucrèce, Livre III, Texte latin, accompagné du commentaire critique et explicatif de Munro, traduit . . . par A. Reymond. Paris, 1903. Very briefly, and in general favorably, mentioned by Henri Bornecque. 9) Augusto Romizi, Compendio di storia della letteratura latina; quinta editone; Sandron, Milano-Palermo-Napoli, 1903. Philippe Fabia commends this work, especially as evincing originality. 10) Two works of H. Bornecque: a) Sénèque le Rhéteur, Controverses et Suasores. Traduction nouvelle, texte revu; ouvrage couronné par l'Académie française. Paris, 1902. b) Les déclamations et les déclamateurs d'après Sénèque le père. Lille, 1902. Philippe Fabia regrets that these works were not prepared for philologists who would have appreciated them and derived benefit from them, instead of for the public, who will not read them. 11) Carolus Enarus Borenus, De Plutarcho et Tacito inter se congruentibus. Diss. inaug., Helsingforsiae, 1902. Philippe Fabia does not accept the author's contention that Plutarch derived his biographies of Galba and Otho from Tacitus with occasional use of the source from which Tacitus drew, but holds that each drew from the same source. 12) Benedetto Romano, La critica letteraria in Aulo Gellio. Torino, 1902. Philippe Fabia highly commends this work, which collects and arranges the literary opinions scattered through the Noctes Atticae.

#### No. 4.

34. Pp. 263-8. On the Proagon, by Paul Mazon. An interesting discussion of the character of the *προάγων*, based on all the ancient references to it.

35. Pp. 269-272. M. L. Earle critically discusses several passages of Vergil, Horace, and Catullus.

36. P. 272. C.-E. Ruelle rejects *ἀνεσιν* as proposed for *πίεσιν* in Aristot. Probl. XIX, 3, by Laloy in his review of the work of Gevaert and Vollgraff in the preceding number of the Rev. de Phil.

37. Pp. 273-8. Latin Studies. III. The subjunctive after quotiens. By Félix Gaffiot. The author modifies his statement which implied that the idea of repetition was never present to the mind of the writer when the subjunctive was used with a relative, but maintains that the subjunctive is never due to this idea. He replies to critics and discusses quotiens-clauses in particular.

38. Pp. 279-287. Notes on the text of the Institutiones of Cassiodorus. (Last article). By Victor Mortet. The author closes this series of important contributions, by filling a lacuna by means of some fragments found in certain MSS, especially two in Munich.

39. P. 288. C. E. R. reports some variants (furnished by a MS in the Bibliothèque nationale) for the text of Prellus *περὶ παραδόξων ἀναγνωσμάτων*.

40. Pp. 289-293. The rôle of Aeneas in the second book of the Aeneid, by A. Cartault. An interesting explanation of Vergil's failure to have his hero make good his lofty assertion "quorum pars magna fui."

41. Pp. 294-310. Book Notices. 1) *Homeri Carmina recensuit* . . . Arth. Ludwich. Pars prior, *Ilias*. Volumen prius. Leipzig, 1902. Reviewed at length by Albert Martin. The reviewer notes the fact that the "pars posterior" appeared thirteen years ago. He analyzes the work and explains the principles followed by the editor in constituting the text. He is not in accord with the author in all these principles nor in all the details, but considers the work very able and useful. 2) *Hesiodi Carmina*. *Accedit Homeri et Hesiodi certamen*. *Recensuit Aloisius Rzach*. Leipzig, 1902. Albert gives an analysis of this monumental work, and highly praises it. 3) C. Gaspar, *Essai de chronologie pindarique*. Bruxelles, 1900. P. Mazon, reviewing this work in the main very favorably, makes some valuable remarks. 4) *Euripidis Fabulae ediderunt R. Prinz et N. Wecklein*. Vol. III. Pars VI. *Rhesus*. *Accedunt addenda et corrigenda, vita Euripidis, tabula*. N. Wecklein. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1902. E. Chambry, making some slight objections to details, highly praises this concluding volume of this great work. 5) *Johannes Kirchner, Prosopographia Attica*. Vol. I, 1901. Vol. II, 1903. Berlin. B. Haussoullier gives a brief and laudatory account of this work. It contains a list of all Athenians known from inscriptions, authors, and coins, Athenians by birth and by decree, from the time of the decennial Archons to the absorption of Attica by the Roman empire. The entries number 24,547. There are two appendixes, one a *Conspectus Demotarum*, the other *Archontum Tabulae*, a list of Archons from B. C. 683 down. With the Archons are enumerated also the Clerks and the tribes to which they belonged. 6) *Μελέται περὶ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς γλώσσης τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ λαοῦ ὑπὸ Ν. Γ. Πολίτου. Παροιμίαι. Τόμος γ.* Athens, 1901. A. M. favorably mentions this volume, referring to his previous mention of the first volumes (*Rev. de Phil.* XXVI, p. 248). This third volume includes B and Γ to γλῶσσαι, and contains 686 pages. 7) *Virgil's epische Technik* von Richard Heinze. Leipzig, 1903. A. Cartault describes this book at considerable length. He considers it an important work, but naturally cannot accept everything where so

much is subjective. 8) P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI erklärt von Eduard Norden. Leipzig, 1903. A. Cartault, though he accepts most of the author's conclusions, condemns his method, and sees no reason why this edition should be one of a series called *Commentaires scientifiques*. 9) *De pauperum cura apud Romanos*. By J. J. Esser. Kampen, 1902. A. Grenier criticises this book with some severity. Its theme seems to be: "les Romains n'ont pu pratiquer la charité, car cette vertu fut enseignée aux hommes par le Christ!" 10) *L'Île Tibérine dans l'antiquité*, par Maurice Besnier. Paris, 1902. A. Grenier gives an analysis of this work, which contains all that is known of the island in the Tiber at Rome. The book (of 357 pages) necessarily treats of a great variety of subjects. 11) *Morceaux choisis de Prosateurs latins du moyen âge et des temps modernes, publiés avec des notices et des notes par P. Thomas*. Gand, 1902. F. Gaffiot commends this work highly, especially as the notes direct attention to departures from classical latinity.

The *Revue des Revues*, begun in a previous number, is completed in this number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.